


#10/C
59-13-03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: James Russell Miller Examiner: Nicholas D. Lucchesi
Serial No.: 09/705,861 Art Unit: 3764
Filed: November 1, 2000
Title: Adjustable Interlocking Iliac Crest Belt for Body Brace
Atty Dkt: BostonBrace/Belt



Certificate of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that the attached correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to Technology Center 3700, Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, via facsimile telephone number 703.872.9302, on this day, June 11, 2003.

Paul L. Speidel
Paul L. Speidel

Technology Center 3700
Mail Stop: NON-FEE AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
TOTAL PAGES: 15

REVISED AMENDMENT

Sir:

The present Revised Amendment is being submitted in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed June 5, 2003. That Notice asserted that our Amendment filed June 3, 2003 lacked "[a] complete listing of all the claims" in this case. The present Revised Amendment includes such a listing, and is considered to meet the requirements of the Notice.

BostonBelt/Belt

- 1 of 15 -

Claims 31-62 are pending in the above-identified patent application.

By the Office Action mailed March 3, 2003:

Claims 31-32, 34, 47-48, 51, 59, and 61-62 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 4,833,730) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 7 of the Office Action.

Claims 31-34 and 47-50 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Morrow (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,147) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 8 of the Office Action.

Claims 35-37, 41, 51-53, and 62 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrow in view of Richards (U.S. Patent No. 5,207,635) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Office Action.

Claims 38-40, 45-46, 54-56, and 61 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrow in view of Richards as applied to claims 37, 51, and 53 and further in view of Modglin (U.S. Patent No. 5,620,412) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claims 41-42 and 57-58 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrow in view of Richards as applied to claims 35 and 51 and further in view of Velazquez (U.S. Patent No. 3,771,513) for the reasons set forth in Paragraph 12 of the Office Action.

In addition, claims 31-46 and 51-62 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 3-5 of the Office Action.